

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 3649 of 1996

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE M.S.PARIKH

=====

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement?
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

RAGHUBHAI SAVABHAI PARMAR

Versus

DISTRICT MAGISTRATE

Appearance:

MR ANIL S DAVE for Petitioner

MR KC SHAH, AGP for Respondents.

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE M.S.PARIKH

Date of decision: 04/09/96

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. By way of this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India the petitioner-detenu-Raghubhai Savabhai Parmar has brought under challenge the detention order dated 6/4/1996 rendered by the respondent no.1 u/S. 3(1) of the Gujarat Prevention of Anti-Social Activities Ac, 1985 (Act No. 16 of 1985), hereinafter referred to as 'the PASA Act'.

2. The grounds on which the impugned order of detention has been passed appear at Annexure-C to the petition. They inter-alia indicate that the petitioner by himself and with the aid of his associates has been carrying on criminal and anti-social activities of storing and selling foreign liquor and following prohibition offences have been registered in the Unjha Police Station against him :-

1) CR 57/95 U/Ss.66(1)B,67A,E, 81, 82, 83, 116(2) of
Bombay Prohi.Act

88 bottles of foreign liquor valued at
Rs.3780/-
Pending trial.

2) CR 77/95 U/Ss.66(1)B,65A,E, 67A, 81, 82, 83 of
Bombay Prohi.Act

36 bottles of foreign liquor valued at
Rs.10,800/-
Pending trial.

3) CR 97/95 U/Ss.66B, 65E, 67A, 80, 81, 82 & 116(2)
of Bombay Prohi. Act

32 bottles of foreign liquor valued at
Rs.4800/-,
Pending trial.

4) CR 210/95 U/Ss. 66B, 65E, 67A & 116 B of Bombay
Prohi. Act

03 bottles of foreign liquor valued at
Rs.450/-,
Pending trial.

It has been submitted and it is not in dispute that the last mentioned case was registered on 15/12/1995 and the petitioner was enlarged on bail on 19/12/1995. It is also not in dispute that the statements of the witnesses were recorded on 16/1/1996 and they were verified on 22/1/1996. Whereas the impugned order of detention has been passed on 6/4/1996.

3. Over and above these cases of prohibition it has been recited in the grounds that confidential statements have been given by seven witnesses alleging that the petitioner has been carrying on illegal and anti-social activity of importing, storing and selling country liquor and also creating an atmosphere of fear.

4. I have heard the learned advocate for the petitioner and learned AGP for the State. The petitioner

has challenged the aforesaid order of detention on number of grounds, inter-alia on the ground of delay as can be seen from the narration of facts and dates quoted above.

5. Although there is no affidavit-in-reply to the aforesaid ground of delay it has been submitted by Mr. K C Shah, Ld. AGP that the delay would not prejudice the petitioner particularly with reference to his right under Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India. This explanation of the Ld. AGP cannot be accepted in view of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of P.N. Paturkar v/s. S. Rama Murti, reported in AIR 1994 SC 656, which has been relied upon in support of the petitioner's cause. In that decision the reference has been made to an earlier decision of the Apex Court in the case of A.T. Abul Rahman v. State of Kerala, (1989) 4 SCC 741 : AIR 1990 SC 225). Following observations have been quoted :-

"The question whether the prejudicial activities of a person necessitating to pass an order of detention is proximate to the time when the order is made or the live-link between the prejudicial activities and the purpose of detention is snapped depends on the facts and circumstances of each case. No hard and fast rule can be precisely formulated that would be applicable under all circumstances and no exhaustive guidelines can be laid down in that behalf. It follows that the test of proximity is not a rigid or mechanical test by merely counting number of months between the offending acts and the order of detention. However, when there is undue and long delay between the detention order, the Court has to scrutinise whether the detaining authority has satisfactorily examined such a delay and afforded a tenable and reasonable explanation as to why such a delay has occasioned, when called upon to answer and further the Court has to investigate whether the causal connection has been broken in the circumstances of each case."

In so far as the present case is concerned, the facts as noted above speak for themselves. The result is that the decision in P.N. Paturkar's case (supra) would be applicable to the facts of the present case.

6. There are other grounds of challenge levelled against the impugned order of detention. However, in view of the fact that the petitioner would succeed directly on the strength of decision of P.N. Paturkar

(supra), it is not necessary to deal with the other grounds. Hence, following order is passed :

The impugned order of detention is hereby quashed and set aside. The petitioner-detenu-Raghubhai Savabhai Parmar shall be forthwith set at liberty if he is not required to be detained in any other case. Rule made absolute accordingly.

* * *